

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/516,447	Applicant(s) BEN-HORIN, RAANAN	
	Examiner JAY R. RIPLEY	Art Unit 3679	

All Participants:

(1) JAY R. RIPLEY.

(2) Mr. Eric S. Hyman.

Status of Application: 71

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 December 2008

Time: 3:30 P.M.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

21, 32, 33 and 35

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Discussed was suggested language for an Examiner's Amendment of the claims to correct antecedent and clarity issues, e.g. antecedence for the term "cone" in claim 32, clarity as to providing sufficient structure for the functional sealing recited in claim 21, and clarity as to which "cone-shaped" structure is intended in claim 33. See attached FAX of 10 December 2008 and accompanying Detailed Office Action for specifics. Applicant agreed that there were issues that could be corrected by Examiner's Amendment.